

DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION OF TECHNOLOGIES TO MITIGATE CORROSION ON INFRASTRUCTURE COMPONENTS AT FORT BRAGG: INITIAL RESULTS

Robert Mason, Larry Gintert, Michael Miller, Kevin Klug, PhD, and Mark
Singleton, PhD

Concurrent Technologies Corporation (*CTC*)

Vincent Hock and Richard Lampo

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Research and Development
Center, Construction Engineering Research Laboratory
(ERDC-CERL)



Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. REPORT DATE FEB 2009 | 2. REPORT TYPE | 3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2009 to 00-00-2009 | | | |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Demonstration and Validation of Technologies to Mitigate Corrosion on Infrastructure Components at Fort Bragg: Initial Results | | 5a. CONTRACT NUMBER | | | |
| | | 5b. GRANT NUMBER | | | |
| | | 5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER | | | |
| 6. AUTHOR(S) | | 5d. PROJECT NUMBER | | | |
| | | 5e. TASK NUMBER | | | |
| | | 5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER | | | |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Concurrent Technologies Corporation (CTC),1901 N Beauregard St,Alexandria,VA,22311 | | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER | | | |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) | | 10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) | | | |
| | | 11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) | | | |
| 12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited | | | | | |
| 13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 2009 U.S. Army Corrosion Summit, 3-5 Feb, Clearwater Beach, FL | | | | | |
| 14. ABSTRACT | | | | | |
| 15. SUBJECT TERMS | | | | | |
| 16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: | | | 17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR) | 18. NUMBER OF PAGES 29 | 19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON |
| a. REPORT unclassified | b. ABSTRACT unclassified | c. THIS PAGE unclassified | | | |

Outline

- Corrosion Issues at Fort Bragg
- Project Description
- Technical Approach
 - Evaluation Procedures
- Technology Application
- Results
- Summary



Corrosion Issues at Fort Bragg

- Serious corrosion of infrastructure components evident at Fort Bragg, NC
- Two key issues
 - Mechanical Rooms
 - Example - newly constructed 16th Military Police Barracks
 - Accelerated corrosion of exposed union joints
 - Significant amount of condensate build-up on insulation covering supply lines
 - Cooling Tower Pumps
 - Relatively new (put on line in 1996) central cooling plant
 - Vertical cooling towers and pumps corroding
 - Total failure due to corrosion within two to four years of operation



Corrosion Issues at Fort Bragg (cont.)

- Mechanical Room Piping



Mechanical Room at Fort Bragg, with corroded piping union joints

Corrosion Issues at Fort Bragg (cont.)

- Cooling Tower Pumps



Cooling towers, Central Cooling Plant, Fort Bragg



Overhead view of pump sump

Corrosion Issues at Fort Bragg (cont.)

- Cooling Tower Pumps (cont.)



Removed pump, showing severe corrosion on shaft (near water surface)

Project Description

- “Demonstration and Validation of Technologies to Mitigate Corrosion on Mechanical Room Utility Piping and Cooling Tower Pumps at Fort Bragg, NC”
- Sponsored by the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) under the Corrosion Technologies for Defense Systems and Infrastructure (CTDSI) Program





Technical Approach

- Mechanical Room Piping and Joints
 - Focus on commercial off the shelf (COTS) solutions
 - Mechanical Room A: Evaluation of Two High Performance Coating Systems
 - White-pigmented, moisture-cure polyurethane coating
 - Ceramic-filled, insulating coating
 - Removable insulation system over top of polyurethane coating
 - Mechanical Room B: Evaluation of Dehumidification System
 - Mechanical Room C: Control



Technical Approach (cont.)

- Dehumidification Systems for Corrosion Protection
 - Mechanical Room B
 - Benefits clearly demonstrated in past efforts



SOURCE: Rob Sorensen and Jeff Braithwaite, "Statistical Modeling of Corrosion Induced Electronic Failures," Presentation for 1997 Life Cycles Workshop, Sandia National Labs, November 4, 1997

SOURCE: D. Perkins and T. Carlson, "Army National Guard Controlled Humidity Preservation Program Overview," 2001 U.S. Army Corrosion Summit, St. Petersburg, FL, February 2001



Technical Approach (cont.)

- Cooling Tower Pumps
 - Focus on COTS solutions
 - Two controls
 - One brand new pump
 - One recently-refurbished pump
 - Two High Performance Coating Systems
 - Paint System No. 21-A-Z
 - Recommended by ERDC-CERL
 - MIL-DTL-24441/19B zinc-rich epoxy (primer), MIL-DTL-24441 Formula 151 (topcoat)
 - “High Performance” Coating System
 - Recommended by coating applicator
 - Already on recently-refurbished pump
 - Epoxy (primer), Multi-Purpose Epoxy (topcoat)
 - Corrosion-Resistant Alloy
 - 316 stainless steel shaft (proposed by manufacturer)



Evaluation Procedures

- Applied Coatings, Insulation, Systems
 - Evaluate in accordance with ASTM and other relevant specifications
- Corrosion Test Coupons in Mechanical Rooms
 - Mild steel, 3" by 6"
 - Two each of different coating systems and two uncoated, bare steel panels
 - One coated test panel for each coating system scribed to base metal in accordance with ASTM D1654; other un-scribed
 - Condition of test panels documented and photographed upon installation
 - Visually inspected on monthly interval



Evaluation Procedures (cont.)

- Corrosion Test Coupons in Cooling Pump Sumps
 - Same procedure as for those in mechanical rooms
- Corrosion Sensors in Cooling Pump Sumps
 - Measure and monitor corrosivity of water system with corrosion rate monitors (electrical resistance sensors)



Technology Application

- Mechanical Room Piping and Joints
 - Existing rust from exposed piping removed
 - Coating systems applied



Pre-installation, chill water pump:
rust evident even on stainless
steel flanges



Primer: aluminum-loaded
polyurethane




Ceramic topcoat

Technology Application (cont.)

- Mechanical Room Piping and Joints
 - Additional protective systems installed



Removable insulation



Dehumidification used in another mechanical room

Technology Application (cont.)

- Cooling Tower Pumps
 - Pumps removed
 - Sandblasted to remove corrosion



Pump being removed



Sandblasting

Technology Application (cont.)

- Cooling Tower Pumps
 - Coating systems applied
 - Pumps reinstalled



Paint System No. 21-A-Z



Epoxy System




316 Stainless Steel



Results

- Mechanical Rooms
 - Coated test panels in all mechanical rooms pristine after twelve months of exposure



Coated Test Panels, Mechanical Room A, Twelve Months of Exposure

Results (cont.)

- Mechanical Rooms (cont.)
 - Coated fittings generally performed well
 - Some corrosion after twelve months of exposure, but only in certain instances
 - Both coatings performed better on hot water lines than on cold water lines, as expected
 - Condensation on cold water lines is a contributor
 - Performance not consistent on all fittings



Coated Union Joints, Mechanical Room A, Twelve Months of Exposure



Results (cont.)

- Mechanical Rooms (cont.)
 - In general, the removable insulation was not effective
 - Difficult to apply, loose fitting
 - Accumulated water (condensation) that dripped out of the ends




Union Joint with Removable Insulation,
Mechanical Room A, Nine Months of Exposure



Union Joint with Insulation Removed,
Mechanical Room A,
Twelve Months of Exposure

Results (cont.)

- Mechanical Rooms (cont.)
 - In general, dehumidification was not effective
 - Dehumidifier, although correctly sized for Mechanical Room B, was not able to effectively and consistently reduce humidity (and subsequently corrosion) in that room




Results (cont.)

- Cooling Tower Pumps
 - Corrosion observed on uncoated panels in sumps in Feb 2009 (one-month exposure)



Results (cont.)

- Cooling Tower Pumps (cont.)
 - After twelve months of exposure, Paint System No. 21-A-Z outperformed commercial epoxy system



Summary

- A number of critical infrastructure corrosion issues have been identified at Fort Bragg
 - Two of the most critical involve the corrosion of piping union joints in mechanical rooms and the corrosion of cooling tower pump shafts
- A number of technologies to mitigate the subject corrosion issues have been identified and are being demonstrated
 - Advanced coatings, removable insulation, and dehumidification for mechanical room piping
 - Advanced coatings and materials for cooling tower pump shafts



Summary (cont.)

- Mechanical Room Technologies
 - Both coatings were effective in reducing corrosion in twelve months of exposure
 - Coatings more effective on hot water lines than cold water lines
 - Corrosion appears to be due to condensation rather than atmosphere
 - Neither dehumidification nor removable insulation appeared to be effective as stand-alone technologies
 - Combination of coatings and dehumidification may be optimal
- Cooling Tower Pump Technologies
 - After twelve months of exposure, Paint System No. 21-A-Z outperformed commercial epoxy system



Acknowledgments

- This work was funded under the CTDSI project, with the support of OSD
- The authors wish to thank
 - Mr. Dan Dunmire and Mr. Richard Kinzie, OSD
 - Mr. Charles Gibbs, Mandaree Enterprises Corporation
 - Mr. Russ Hayes, Fort Bragg DPW
 - Dr. Gay Kendall, Fort Bragg
 - Mr. Al Beitelman, ERDC-CERL
 - M&T Machine
 - Honeywell Fort Bragg



Thank You!

Questions?



Backup Slides



Introduction - Corrosion of Military Infrastructure

- Military facilities affected by severe corrosion
 - CONUS and OCONUS
 - From 2003¹:
 - More than two-thirds of military facilities unable to meet certain mission requirements
 - Degradation of runways and airstrips
 - Degradation of maintenance facilities (Navy aircraft hanger ceiling)
 - Corrosion of aircraft refueling equipment
 - Corrosion of fire protection assets
 - Degradation of electrical and command/control facilities
- Application of appropriate available corrosion prevention technologies (coatings, materials, etc.) can address this problem

¹Source: "Defense Management: Opportunities to Reduce Corrosion Costs and Increase Readiness,"
United States General Accounting Office Report to Congressional Committees, July 2003



Project Description (cont.)

- Project Objectives
 - Demonstrate/validate technologies to address corrosion problems in barracks mechanical room piping/joints and cooling tower pumps/systems at Fort Bragg, NC
 - Modify standard operating procedures and procurement guidelines as needed
 - Demonstrate enhanced long-term system reliability and safety at reduced costs compared to current practices
- Project Team
 - Concurrent Technologies Corporation (*CTC*)
 - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Research & Development Center Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (ERDC-CERL) – Project Manager
 - Fort Bragg Department of Public Works (DPW)
 - Other contractors

